REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated February 5, 2010 ("*Office Action*"). At the time of the *Office Action*, Claims 1-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 were pending and rejected. Applicants amend Claims 14-17. Claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 31 were previously canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Section 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,976,210 issued to Silva et al. ("*Silva*"). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 30.

Independent Claim 1 of the present Application, as amended, recites:

> A method for defining a composite web page, comprising:
> identifying a web page;
> analyzing the web page to determine a list of HTML tags, each HTML tag corresponding to a particular portion of the content of the identified web page;
> presenting the determined list of HTML tags to a user in a navigation pane, the navigation pane presenting the determined list of HTML tags in the form of a tree structure that provides a visual representation of relationships between the HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of the identified web page, the navigation pane operable to allow the user to view and select one or more of the HTML tags corresponding to particular portions of the content of the identified web page from the determined list of HTML tags;
> receiving a user selection of at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags in the form of the tree structure;
> in response to receiving the user selection of the at least one HTML tag, presenting, in a preview pane, the particular portion of the content of the identified web page corresponding to the at least one selected HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags, the preview pane operable to allow the user to visually verify the user selection;
> registering the user selection of the at least one HTML tag from the determined list of HTML tags; and
> rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page for display on a second computer, the placement of the identified portion of content on the composite web page determined automatically, at the time of rendering and when the composite webpage is requested, based on one or more run-

time variables comprising the dimensions of a window to display the composite web page on the second computer.

.

Whether considered alone or in combination with any other cited references, *Silva* does not disclose, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of the claims.[1]

For example, *Silva* does not disclose, teach, or suggest "rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page for display on a second computer, the placement of the identified portion of content on the composite web page determined automatically, at the time of rendering and when the composite webpage is requested, based on one or more run-time variables comprising the dimensions of a window to display the composite web page on the second computer," as recited in amended Claim 1. *Silva* merely discloses that the user "defines a layout of such information content within the clipping, if necessary, and the layout of the clipping itself within the totality of the composite Web view." (*Silva*, Column 1, lines 57-64) Table 1 of *Silva*, which the Examiner has identified, merely shows the internal representation of the Web view specified by the user. (*Silva*, Column 9, lines 28-55). With respect to the design of the Web view, *Silva* describes that the user uses a web clipping manager to specify the layout of information content. (*Silva*, Column 8, line 22 through Column 9, line 15). *Silva* describes:

> Once the Web Clipping manager has created the extraction script and the refresh frequency has been specified together with an optional notification mechanism, the layout of the clipping *may need to be specified* if it contains more than one element from a source page. Further, the layout of the clipping with respect to the entire Web view may be *specified such as by specifying the size of the frame that the clipping should occupy, the X, Y coordinates* of where the information within the clipping is to be placed and other options such as, for example, whether or not the clipping is scrollable. A default layout can also be specified in which case the system will place the Web clipping in the Web view according to how the system determines them to be best placed. The layout may also be specified by a

---

[1] "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP § 2131. In addition, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claims" and "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Bond*, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990); MPEP § 2131 (*emphasis added*).

> point-and-click-and-drag interface, where *users visually manipulate frames* corresponding to Web clippings, to resize them, and place them at a desired position within the Web view window.

(*Silva*, Column 8, line 66 through Column 9, line 15). Thus, *Silva* indicates that the user inputs the layout information including the X, Y coordinates and the sizing the of the information content. Although *Silva* very generally discloses that the system may use a default setting to determine the layout based on what the system determines is best, there is no disclosure that the system of *Silva* has information relating to the dimensions of the window of the system that is making the request for the rendering. Accordingly, *Silva* does not disclose, teach, or suggest "rendering the identified portion of content corresponding to the at least one HTML tag to form the composite web page for display on a second computer, the placement of the identified portion of content on the composite web page determined automatically, at the time of rendering and when the composite webpage is requested, based on one or more run-time variables comprising the dimensions of a window to display the composite web page on the second computer," as recited in amended Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1, together with Claims 2-8, 18, and 22 that depend on Claim 1. For analogous reasons, Applicants also request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 9, 14, 15, 16, and 17, together with Claims 10-13, 20, 24 that depend on Claim 9 and Claims 26, 28, 30, and 32 that depend on Claims 14, 15, 16, and 17, respectively.

No Waiver

All of Applicants' arguments and amendments are without prejudice and disclaimer. Additionally, Applicants have merely discussed example reasons for allowability sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections. Applicants reserve the right to discuss additional reasons for allowance, such as additional distinctions over the references cited, the improper combination of the cited references, or the improper use of one or more references as prior art, in a later Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. By not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Jenni R. Moen, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 415-4820.

Applicants believe no fees are due; however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credits to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Jenni R . Moen
Reg. No. 52,038

Date: March 24, 2010

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

at Customer No.   **05073**